IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

-

WRIT PETITION No.23218 of 2001

Between:

1 K.Nagaraju S/o K.V.Narayana, R/o H.No.1-8-215/38 A & B,

Prenderghast Road, Secunderabad.

2 K.Srinivas S/o K.V.Narayana, R/o H.No.1-8-215/38 A & B,

Prenderghast Road, Secunderabad.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1 The Govt. of A.P., Rep By Its Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad.
2 The Govt of A.P., Rep By Its Station House Officer, Ramgopalpet,

Police Station, Secundrabad.

3 The Minicipal Corporation of Hyd., Rep By Its Addl.Commissioner
Secundrabad Division, Secundrabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue any appropriate Writ, order or direction preferably a Writ in the Nature of Mandamus, declaring the action of the respondents in forcibly taking away the fruit juice vending machine and the stainless steel utensils (Counters) including the wooden counter (Chat Counter) belonging to the petitioner, as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Art.14 of the Constitution of India and also declare the action of the respondents in harassing the petitioners in doing their lawful business as per the permission and sanctions as also being violative of Art.14 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents not to interfere with the business of the petitioner and to return the articles that have been illegally taken away on 6/11/2001

namely: fruit juice vending machine and the stainless steel utensils (Counters) including the wooden counter (Chat Counter).

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.P.VENUGOPAL/MR.T.C.DHANA SEKHAR

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 and 2: G.P. FOR HOME

Counsel for the Respondent No.3: SMT.G.JYOTHI KIRAN

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

Mr.T.C.Dhanasekhar, learned Advocate representing Mr.P.Venugopal, learned Counsel for the petitioners, submits that the respondents have already returned various articles to the petitioner and in that view of the matter nothing survives in this writ petition.

The writ petition is, therefore, dismissed as infructuous.

_____

(V.V.S.RAO,J)

28.06.2005

YS

To

1 The Commissioner of Police, Government of A.P., Hyderabad.
2 The Station House Officer, Ramgopalpet P.S., Secunderabad.
3 The Addl. Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad, Secundrabad Division, Secundrabad.

4 Two CCs to the Government Pleader for Home,

High Court Buildings, Hyderabad. (OUT)

5 Two C.D. Copies.